

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 388

HE 012 125

AUTHOR Abrams, Irwin; Heller, Francis H.
 TITLE Evaluating Academic Programs Abroad: The CIEE Project. CIEE Occasional Papers on International Educational Exchange No. 21.
 INSTITUTION Council on International Educational Exchange, New York, N.Y.
 PUB DATE Feb 78
 NOTE 16p.; For related document see HE 012 123
 AVAILABLE FROM Council on International Educational Exchange, 777 UN Plaza, New York, NY 10017
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Educational Quality: Evaluation Criteria: *Evaluation Methods: Exchange Programs: Foreign Countries: Higher Education: International Education: *International Educational Exchange: *Program Effectiveness: Standards: Student Experience: *Study Abroad
 IDENTIFIERS *Council on International Educational Exchange: Self Evaluation (Groups)

ABSTRACT

The evaluation of overseas educational programs for U.S. students by the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) is discussed. The history of the CIEE is reviewed from its beginnings in 1947 when its members were national programming agencies concerned with making travel arrangements for summer programs. As the CIEE grew in membership, the concern for distinguishing among programs and maintaining quality programs deepened, leading to the development of the CIEE Evaluation Service in 1972. The purpose of the evaluation service is to establish means for quality control through which member institutions could help one another improve their programs. To participate, an institution first undergoes self-study according to the CIEE guide. This self-study is followed by a site visit from CIEE. Each visiting team from CIEE submits two reports on the educational program. A technical report, solely for the use of the team members, contains no substantive findings about the specific programs. Reports are also prepared for the participating institutions. Included in the reports to the institution are a brief description of the program; a schedule of the visit; a summarized evaluation of the program, setting forth recommendations and responses; and a section-by-section analysis of the program. The effectiveness of the CIEE evaluation process is discussed and it is suggested that their reports enable institutions to improve the quality of the overseas educational experience.
 (SF)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

CIE OCCASIONAL PAPERS

on International Educational Exchange

Evaluating Academic
Programs Abroad:
The CIEE Project

ED180388

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CIEE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

**Evaluating Academic Programs Abroad:
The CIEE Project**

Irwin Abrams
Professor of History
Antioch College

Francis H. Heller
Professor of Law and Political Science
University of Kansas

February, 1978

This paper, first released at the CIEE's Annual Membership Conference in November 1975, was prepared by Dr. Abrams and Dr. Heller following their participation in a CIEE evaluation project in Germany and Austria during May 1975. The third member of the 1975 team was Dr. Thomas Huber, Dean of the German School at Middlebury College.

The authors have summarized the history of the CIEE's activity in the area of evaluation of overseas educational programs for U.S. students and have identified some of the issues related to study abroad observed by those who, since 1972, have been involved in the CIEE evaluation team projects.

The most recent cooperative evaluation effort occurred during November 1977, when a team visited the programs of three U.S. institutions in Spain. The technical report of the 1977 team is not yet complete; when the authors cite the views of the teams, they are referring to the observations of the 1972, 1973 and 1975 CIEE evaluation teams. Reference is made by the authors to these teams' *Technical Reports* and to the *Guide to Institutional Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Programs Abroad*. The *Reports* as well as the *Guide* are available upon request from CIEE.

Dr. Irwin Abrams, Professor of History at Antioch College, has served as a member of that institution's International Education Committee and is presently directing a research study on the impact of the Antioch Education Abroad Program. He has chaired CIEE evaluation teams to France and England, and was a member of the evaluation team that visited programs in Germany and Austria. As Coordinator of International Programs for the Great Lakes Colleges Association, he has participated in field evaluations of programs in Beirut and Bogotá, and organized and directed the first years of the GLCA European Term on Comparative Urban Studies. Dr. Abrams has authored various articles on study abroad, including a pamphlet entitled *New Dimensions in Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1960). He contributed the chapter "The Student Abroad" in *Higher Education, Some Newer Developments* edited by Sam Baskin (New York: McGraw Hill, 1965). A member of the 1963-65 CIEE Evaluation Project Committee, Dr. Abrams assisted in the formulation of the *Guide to Institutional Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Programs Abroad*.

Currently the Roy A. Roberts Professor of Law and Political Science at the University of Kansas, Dr. Francis H. Heller also served as that institution's Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculties, and as its Director of Study Abroad Programs. Dr. Heller has served as a consultant-examiner for the North Central Association. As a member of the Council's Board of Directors, he participated on the 1963-65 Evaluation Project Committee which developed the *Guide to Institutional Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Programs Abroad*. In 1975, he chaired the CIEE evaluation team project to Germany and Austria.

Background: The Council on International Educational Exchange

When the Council on Student Travel was founded in 1947, nearly all its members were national programming agencies such as the YMCA, the American Youth Hostels Association and The Experiment in International Living, whose chief concern was in making travel arrangements for the students who participated in their summer programs. The next two decades saw a spectacular growth of academic programs abroad, which was reflected in the changed composition of Council membership, three-quarters of which was now academic institutions. In 1967, the Council on Student Travel was appropriately rechristened the Council on International Educational Exchange.

In the annual conferences sponsored by the Council, the improvement of overseas programs has been a constantly recurring topic. The concern for standards led to the establishment of the Committee on Academic Programs Abroad in 1958. In concert with the Institute of International Education and other agencies, the Council then organized a series of national meetings that directed attention to the quality of American educational programs abroad and sought to formulate a set of standards.

Two of the most important documents resulting from this quest for quality were the report prepared by Dr. Stephen A. Freeman and his committee of the Institute of International Education in 1964, entitled *Undergraduate Study Abroad*, and the *Guide to Institutional Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Programs Abroad*, issued by the Council in 1965. The *Guide* was developed by the Committee on Academic Programs Abroad and edited by the Evaluation Project Committee, chaired by John A. Wallace, then Executive Vice President of The Experiment in International Living. Fifteen committees worked on the preparation of the *Guide*, drawing upon the practical experience in international education of close to 100 persons representing more than 70 educational institutions.

The *Guide* was designed to provide institutions with a means for systematically planning and evaluating their overseas program efforts. It was intended neither as a test for Council membership — although institutions were asked to present a report on a self-study in making application for membership in the Council — nor as an instrument for accrediting purposes. The Council has long encouraged regional accrediting agencies to take cognizance of overseas programs in their institutional evaluations, but it has never sought an accrediting function for itself.¹

The *Guide* is an ambitious effort to cover all the important aspects of foreign study programs. Of the twenty sections, twelve are applicable to undergraduate programs, four deal with the kind of non-academic programs that the Council was originally formed to facilitate, and four are concerned with programs for secondary school students. Each section lists the materials that should be examined, states the relevant guiding principles on which there is some consensus among educators, presents a detailed list of questions that should be asked, and ends with a grade to be based on a summary of the answers: excellent, satisfactory, or poor.

The *Guide* and the Freeman report were used by and appear to have influenced the development of many of the more effective overseas study programs, but a flood of new programs in recent years, especially those established by "commercial" agencies, intensified the problems. By the end of the 1960s most institutions permitted their students to earn academic credit overseas, but the foreign study advisor on campus was hard put to help students make the wisest choices among the welter of opportunities beckoning them abroad.

The Development of the CIEE Evaluation Service

At the Annual Membership Conference of the CIEE in 1970, the deepening concern for distinguishing among programs and maintaining quality programs prompted the Council to form a Committee on Evaluation with the mandate to develop a cooperative program evaluation service for member institutions. The Committee's proposals were presented at the Annual Conference in November 1971, and the first pilot project was undertaken in the spring of 1972.

The purpose of the evaluation service was clearly stated as that of establishing means for quality control through which member institutions would help one another improve their programs. It was emphasized that this service was not to be viewed as a step toward accreditation or as a new method of admitting members to CIEE. Participation in the evaluation service was not to imply admission into a circle of the chosen; it was simply to be public acknowledgement that the institution had received outside professional evaluation of its program. To participate, an institution would first make a self-study using the *Guide* as a basis for its report. Then a team of evaluators appointed by the Council would visit the overseas program and the campus. The project would be cooperative in that the participating institutions would share the costs of the overseas visits, while the evaluation team would serve without honoraria and would be drawn from other member schools, which in return could look toward evaluation of their own programs in the future. The CIEE staff would provide the secretariat but would not enter directly into the evaluation. The report would be submitted by the team only to the participating institution; the institution in turn would be encouraged to make the report public, but only *in toto*, not partially.

Four programs in France were chosen for the initial project: the University of Colorado's program at the Université de Bordeaux, the independent study programs in Besançon of The Experiment in International Living's School for International Training, the program of Beloit College at the Université de Haute Bretagne and the CIEE's Cooperative International Program for Teacher Education, both of the latter two in Rennes.

A number of factors entered into these choices: all were easily reached from Paris, where the CIEE office could provide secretarial services and logistic support; the four represented different types of program design, including both conventional and experimental elements; and they were all in session during a fortnight when the team members were able to make the visit.

The evaluation team was composed of Irwin Abrams (chairman), Professor of History, Antioch College, and then Coordinator of International Programs, Great Lakes Colleges Association; Howard A. Cutler, Executive Vice President, Institute of International Education; Lewi M. Hoskins, Professor of History and Director of International Programs, Earlham College; and Daniel S. Russell, Assistant Professor of French and Director of the Study Program in Rouen, University of Pittsburgh.

The pilot project was followed shortly by the evaluation of the programs in London of Earlham College and Eckerd College, respectively. As in the case of the programs in France, geographic factors were important in the organization of this evaluation venture. Irwin Abrams again served as team chairman, with John A. Wallace and Henry D. Weaver, Provost of Goshen College, as the other members. These three were joined by Brian G. Palmer, Vice Principal, Berkshire College of Education, as consultant.

A third series of evaluation was undertaken in May 1975, when a CIEE team visited the programs of Heidelberg College at the Ruprecht-Karl-Universität in Heidelberg, of Wayne State University at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich, and of the University of New Hampshire at the Paris-Londron Universität in Salzburg. Irwin Abrams again participated on a team chaired by Francis H. Heller, Professor of Law and Political Science at the University of Kansas and a former director of foreign study programs at that institution. Thomas Huber, Dean of the German School at Middlebury College and author of a 1970 IIE report on university conditions in West Germany, was the third member.

The fourth and most recent series of evaluations occurred during November 1977, when a CIEE team visited the programs of Syracuse University at the Centro Iberoamericana de Cooperación in Madrid, the University of California and University of Illinois program at the University of Barcelona, and the Undergraduate Language Program at the University of Seville administered by the CIEE. The 1977 Team was chaired by Merle E. Simmons, Chairman of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Indiana University, with Henry D. Weaver, and Enrique Pupo-Walker, Professor of Spanish at Vanderbilt University and Director of the Vanderbilt-in-Spain program in Madrid. Diego Catalán, Professor of Spanish Literature at the University of California/San Diego and Director of the University of California Study Center in Madrid, and Samuel Zimmerman, Professor of Spanish-American Literature at Southern Methodist University and Director of the SMU Program in Madrid, participated as members of the team during the visit to the CIEE program in Seville in place of Messrs. Weaver and Pupo-Walker. This change

in team composition during the visit to the CIEE program in Seville was suggested since Henry Weaver also serves as Chairman of the CIEE Board of Directors. Enrique Pupo-Walker was required to turn his attention to duties as Director of the Vanderbilt University Program in Madrid during the team visit to Seville.

Preparation for the Evaluation Visit

In most evaluations of academic programs of American colleges and universities, the institutional self-study that precedes the evaluator's visit is potentially the most productive element of the entire process. When an accreditation team is due to visit an institution, the self-study often involves sizeable segments of the faculty and of the administration. Whether this will be the case when it is an overseas program that is to be evaluated will depend on the extent to which the overseas program is, in fact, a part of the institutional program.

Many foreign study programs — and especially the older ones — originated in the enthusiasm, industry and connections of one individual. More often than not, the administration and the faculty were content to let this pioneer "do his thing," provided only that he made no claim on the resources of the institution. Often this detachment of the overseas program continued even after the program's founder retired or moved away. In such cases, the need to prepare a self-study serves to focus attention on the basic issue of the program's place within the institution.

The teams were able to discern marked differences in the scope and quality of the self-studies. In some instances it was quite evident that the college (or university) was directly involved; elsewhere, even basic items of information were not available on the home campus. Some self-studies were clearly the result of thoughtful deliberations by faculty committees; others showed all the marks of having been assembled by only one person.

In order to assist the institutions with the preparation of the self-study, the 1972 team produced a series of suggestions which were sent out in advance of self-studies in later years. While these suggestions were apparently put to good use by some institutions, the need to consult both the *Guide* and the suggestions for its use resulted in added effort and, occasionally, some confusion. Each of the teams therefore concluded that it would be desirable to bring the *Guide* up to date and to sharpen its focus, and each so recommended to the Council.

A visit to the home campus by one or two members of the team has been regarded as an essential element of the preparatory phase from the inception of the program. The purpose is not only to discuss the overseas program with appropriate administrators but also to gain a sense of the atmosphere and the dynamics. Where feasible, students who have participated in the overseas program and students who are scheduled to study there in the near future are also interviewed.

The team itself gathers for a one-day meeting with the Council staff several weeks before its scheduled departure for the overseas location. At this time policies and procedures are reviewed and adjustments of the schedule discussed. Conceivably, as a corps of experienced evaluators is developed, the need for this conference may disappear; so far it has been found useful and, indeed, some participants in the process have expressed the hope that it might be made both more comprehensive and more intensive.

The Overseas Visit

At each location the respective Resident Director has been requested, as far in advance as possible, to block out a program for the visiting team. The request indicates the team's expectation to have opportunities for conferences with the Resident Director and other program administrators (if any), instructors in the program and (where appropriate) from the host university, students in the program, and relevant administrators of the host university. Since time is of the essence, courtesy calls should be included only where local conditions indicate that they will be useful to the program. For the same reason, the Resident Director is asked to forego the scheduling of purely social occasions and advised to leave the evenings open for the team's own work.

It is in the evenings that team members compare and evaluate their findings and plan for the next day's meetings. The categories of the *Guide* serve as the organizational outline for these discussions.

The utilization of the evening hours permits the team to formulate preliminary observations which can be shared with the Resident Director. Comments obtained in response can then be incorporated into the report.

Resident Directors are often apprehensive about the team's visit. Almost without exceptions, they lack — even if they are Americans — familiarity with the accreditation processes so common in this country. As a result they are apt to perceive the evaluation visit as, at least implicitly, a threat to them. The teams soon learned that it was important to stress that their purpose was not evaluation as an end in itself but "evaluation/consultation," with the emphasis on the latter. Efforts should and undoubtedly will be made in the future to minimize any apprehensions of this kind.

Reporting the Findings

Each team prepares two kinds of reports. One is for the Council, informally designated the "Technical Report." It is initially drafted by the team chairman and revised after review by the other members of the team. In this report the team relates how it went about its task and offers recommendations for future evaluations. No substantive findings of any kind about the specific programs are included in this report.

Secondly — though sequentially first — the teams prepare individual reports to the participating institutions. These are treated as confidential, with copies going only to the institution, whose decision it then is whether or not the report is to have wider distribution. CIEE also solicits for the record the institution's evaluation of the team's evaluation report.

Included in the reports to the institution are a brief description of the program as the team found it; a schedule of the visit; a summarized evaluation of the program, setting forth recommendations and responses to the questions originally addressed to the team; and a section-by-section analysis of the program, based on the categories of the *Guide* slightly modified as follows: (1) Objectives; (2) Selection of Participants; (3) Orientations of Participants; (4) Counseling and Guidance; (5) Cross-Cultural Encounter; Impact on Local Community; (6) Program Evaluation; (7) Director, Faculty, Staff; (8) Facilities; (9) Curriculum, Academic Level, Testing, Grading and Evaluation of Students; (10) Finances; (11) Administration; (12) Reciprocity with Overseas Institutions.

The team attempts to evaluate each program in the light of the program's own stated objectives. Team members, of course, have their own preferences, but make every effort to disclose them. Thus the 1972 team prefaced its technical report with the statement that the team

came to its task with certain assumptions and predispositions which influenced its evaluation. We began with the assumption that foreign study is a good idea. We were clear about certain criteria of quality that we looked for in the programs visited. In program design we looked for that which could not be done as well at home, the use of learning resources that took full advantage of the local environment, a cross-cultural immersion in some depth, experiential learning in an academic context fostering intellectual rigor. We looked for structure in a program, not in the number of classroom hours but rather in coherence of program design. . .

We recognized that in sharing these values we were perhaps not allowing for enough diversity of opinion, but these are the same values that are reflected in the Council's *Guide to Institutional Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Programs Abroad*.²

The emphasis in this statement is obviously on the learning process and the educational outcomes of the programs examined. Administrative policies and procedures are, of course, also carefully considered, but perhaps the most significant recommendations generally deal with the foreign programs as designs for learning.

A recurrent concern is the dichotomy that most students and some administrators see between "academic" learning and "non-academic" experience. "Much of what the student learns in overseas programs," observed the 1972 team, "lies in the realm often derogated by academics as the 'non-academic,' but which actually can involve a high level of intellectual attainment in understanding and coping with the foreign culture. The returned students themselves associate the 'academic' with classroom learning and speak with more enthusiasm about what they have learned extra-curricularly, although they find it difficult to be specific." Similarly, in 1973 the team found "students associating the 'academic' with books and classroom learning and speaking with enthusiasm about their 'non-academic' experiences in discovering London. . . ." That same team observed that students had a "guilt-laden attitude that 'academic' chores must be finished" before the "non-academic" explorations can begin.

That the American undergraduate is typically preoccupied with the extrinsic trappings of academic bookkeeping (grades, credit hours, etc.) has been amply documented.³ The CIEE teams found that, removed by an ocean from deans and registrars, students abroad become even more concerned about such matters than they do in the familiar environment of the home campus. Resident directors, if they are of the host country, are baffled by the system; if they are Americans, they commonly lack the kind of experience that would allow them to assuage the student's worst fears. In either case, paranoia is given ample opportunity to develop. Thus no complaint is heard more frequently than: "I have been trying to find out how this is going to show up on my transcript and I can't get anybody to give me a straight answer."

But it is not only the student's preoccupation with grades that produces the split between "academic" learning and "non-academic" experience. More often than not, program administrators are explicitly enjoined — or believe that it is their implicit charge — to make sure that "standards" are maintained. "Standards," however, in the context of American education, means grades. Hence committees on the home campus worry about the translation of evaluative terms used by foreign universities, and program administrators abroad are caught between the students' demand for a favorable formula and their own desires to demonstrate "respectability" by the use of a "tough" formula.

Sanders and Ward⁴ define as a central purpose of study abroad programs "the broadening of students through their total immersion in another culture" and they warn against programs that treat participants as tourists. This warning is, of course, well taken. It was precisely because such "touristy" programs had increasingly posed as academic ventures that CIEE undertook, first, to prepare its *Guide* and, secondly, to provide the evaluation/consultation service described in this paper. But the present authors, at least, would disagree with the simplistic assumption that, in order to be "respectable," a program must replicate abroad what happens at home. On the contrary, we would insist that the central purpose quoted above can be achieved only if the whole person, not merely the classroom learner in the person, is involved.

This calls for flexibility, and each of the teams has sounded this note in its reports to the home institutions. Independent study, which provides both flexibility and the ready opportunity for entry into the host culture, has not been utilized to any wide extent. The 1972 team sought to facilitate — though with little visible success so far — a wider use of independent study by the inclusion in its technical report of a set of guidelines for the employment of independent study as an ingredient of study abroad. The two next teams found it necessary to stress the same points and to include references to (or actually reproduce) this portion of the 1972 report.

Another theme to be found in the reports of all three teams is the need for more systematic methods of program evaluation. The 1975 team thus observed in one of its institutional reports: "As is not untypical with study abroad programs, the area of evaluation had obviously received little attention." Some institutions employ end-of-program questionnaires; a few have circularized program alumni. But even where such beginnings have been made, they have tended to be quite unsophisticated and to solicit impressionistic responses to often peripheral queries.

It is easier, of course, to count noses than to estimate impact. Moreover, everybody knows that the instrument that will supply the most convincing evidence for provosts, deans and business officers is the adding machine. The inclination of academic institutions — regrettably, we add — seems to be to keep score in this way, to count the number of students in courses, to compare GPAs, to list materials produced, and to leave assessment of impact — when this is envisaged at all — to others.

These others, the outside consultants, may be fashioners of instruments or skilled and experienced observers. As in all educational assessment they will have to take much on faith. Horace Mann used to refer to the products of his labors as the "unseen harvest." Indeed, the most significant results of educational programs are certain qualities of mind and spirit that we do not know for sure how to contrive to inspire, let alone how to capture and translate into measurable terms. Whatever we can see of the harvest needs a long time to ripen. Yet there is a need to show what impact a given educational experience has — and financial stringencies often compel the need for such evidence to be produced on a short — rather than a long-range, basis.

Certain of the outcomes that concern us can be measured by instruments that have been developed, such as tests for information acquisition, critical thinking, foreign language skills, and personality and attitude change.⁵ Great strides have been made in recent years in educational evaluation, both of student learning and of institutional performance. Most relevant for purposes of study abroad programs may be the efforts to study educational innovation and non-traditional education. The examination of off-campus programs and competency-based curricula may have much to tell us about the all-important behavioral components of international education.⁶ From still other directions have come new insights and methodologies in cross-cultural research, and studies of intercultural communication and the impact of participation in international activities.⁷

The most telling evidence of the influence of international education programs is, of course, behavioral. The inadequacy of the numbers game as applied to curriculum materials is a case in point. As Klassen, Imig and Iff report in their survey of teacher education programs, the millions of dollars that have been spent to prepare and disseminate curriculum materials that would incorporate international or intercultural concepts have produced an important body of materials — which "are too often neglected or ignored in professional preparation programs."⁸

In identifying critical evidence of behavior, we may get some important help from those social scientists, like Webb and Hodgkinson, who are developing unobtrusive measures for inferential evaluation of phenomena.⁹ The campus ethos usually has more to do with shaping student attitudes than any course syllabus, and we will learn many things by reading the bulletin board in the Student Union, inspecting the bookstore, and observing the behavior of minority groups. These lessons are — *mutatis mutandis* — clearly applicable to any effort to assess the impact of a foreign environment and the cross-cultural encounter on the American student abroad.

The challenge of the cross-cultural encounter is another theme that runs through all three years' reports. The 1975 team observed that

it is, of course, a truism that there is nothing more frustrating in most overseas programs than the matter of cross-cultural communication. There is interest in the foreign visitor to the extent that he represents something unusual and novel; once he ceases to be a novelty, his insistence that he be afforded an opportunity to share in the life and experiences of the host community is sometimes seen as a burden and rarely receives much encouragement. Much, of course, depends on individual initiative, and some students... have obviously used their initiative intelligently and fruitfully. Other students who may by nature be more retiring have been retiring in the [foreign] setting as well and have met only few [nationals of the host country]. As long as these students are willing to perceive that it is their own character which conditions their ability to enter into the life of the [host] community [be it student or adult], there is nothing that deserves to be specifically noted. However, if the student experiences frustration over his or her lack of cross-cultural communication and is not willing to admit that it is his or her lack of initiative that is often largely to blame, then it will be the program that will be charged with having failed to live up to [explicit or implicit] promises.

But, even granted the critical importance of personality factors, is there a responsibility of the study abroad program to encourage cross-cultural communication, perhaps even to provide the structures within which such communication can develop? Among the nine programs reviewed by the Council's teams, the full range of possibilities were encountered. There was one program that, as a matter of policy, would let the students find their own housing and handle their own enrollment; there was another program that virtually took the student by the hand from beginning to end. The members of all teams agreed that much depends on the particular setting: what is appropriate in Dijon may not work in London — and *vice versa*.

At the same time the teams also agreed that, whatever is done at the overseas location, much more can and should be done to prepare students for the cross-cultural encounter. "Students," the 1972 team urged, "should be equipped with tools of cultural observation and analysis." Here sociologists and anthropologists on the home campus may be of assistance. Readiness for and adaptability to cross-cultural communication deserves to be considered in the admissions process; attention should be given to the need to have these matters reduced to writing or, where this has previously been done, seeing to it that the descriptions are up to date. It is also suggested that contingency plans for the replacement of unexpectedly incapacitated or unavailable administrators be included in any such administrative plan.

The teams all recognized that local conditions must determine the specific arrangements, but they favored faculty participation through a responsible committee and saw merit in a committee broadly representative of the faculty rather than one based on only a small segment (e.g. the appropriate foreign language department). Such an arrangement serves not only to bring wider views to bear on the program but also to extend the support it has within the campus community.

"Reciprocity" did not appear in the CIEE *Guide* as a separate category for evaluation. The first evaluation venture, however, already demonstrated the need to focus on this issue. Hence the 1972 team called for clearer recognition of the way in which the foreign universities were actually subsidizing American study programs and asked that special effort be made to

interpret the "hidden subsidies" received abroad to campus administrators, who can help plan reciprocal activities. Cooperation among American institutions, especially in inviting scholars from the host culture to their campuses, is strongly recommended. Moreover, reciprocity has an important pay-off for the American institution, as it increases the potential for developing program continuity in the [host] community. There develops a continuity of awareness on the part of the [hosts], a continuity of good will and a continuity of interest in the American institution and its students. The team is convinced that reciprocity can be a good deal more than just a way to pay back the [hosts].

The 1975 team took note of the mounting pressure of potential students on universities abroad, to argue that it is becoming increasingly more important for American overseas programs to strengthen their ties with the host institutions.

Ideally, the host institution should be so committed to the U.S. program that it will protect it against generalized rules restricting the admission of students from foreign countries. This, of course, cannot be expected unless there are some benefits and advantages which the host institution derives from the relationship. What can be done to create or to enhance reciprocity will, of course, differ from institution to institution. We merely urge — but we do so emphatically — that the matter be given early and careful attention. Failure to do so may lead to a sudden realization that yesterday's [or today's] opportunities abroad are no longer open.

The Evaluation Process Evaluated

Each of the teams, in its technical report to CIEE, addressed itself to procedures of the evaluation itself. The selection of the team was always seen as crucial. Team members should be persons who are well regarded professionally as academics and who are knowledgeable about overseas study. The team chairman should be appointed first and he should consult closely with CIEE about building the remainder of the team to provide the necessary balance and variety of resources. Balance between teaching and administrative experience is important. At least two or three members of the team should be fluent in the language of the area where the programs are to be studied. If the programs vary considerably both in level and character, the team might well represent to some extent this variety; for example, both university and college personnel should be included. Language as well as general studies fields should be represented. A current or recent program director from the area being examined can provide both expertise in the host country's civilization and administrative experience with his program. There should, of course, if at all possible, be congeniality among the team, since there will be a considerable time of intensive effort and a large measure of frustration. There must be a sharing of objectives and concerns and mutual confidence. A good sense of humor is highly desirable.

In inviting persons to join the team, the gains — both institutional and personal — can be emphasized. Their institutions may profit from their recent evaluation experience. For the individual team member his experience is intense and exciting, drawing on all the expertise he can muster from previous experiences both intellectually and in personal relationships. It is all-demanding but all-rewarding. The team relationships and functions become, in themselves, a source of great personal satisfaction. At the same time, those invited need to be apprised that this is a most arduous assignment, involving ten- to twelve-hour days, with mealtimes used for meetings and with little time off. In practice, the team members are spending every waking moment thinking, discussing or writing about the programs. A team member should have no other local commitment to distract him from the evaluation assignment.

With an experienced and dedicated team, and with the effective management of schedule, it was found possible to make a reasonable field visit for one program in two to two and one-half days. It must be remembered that this visit was preceded by careful study of the program documentation and followed by team discussions, the two-day campus visit, and report writing. It would probably be fair to calculate the total time required for each program as about 22 man-days.

Each team recommended that the *Guide* be updated. It has proved exceptionally useful both to the institutions in assembling documentation and to the teams in the analysis of programs. But as the first effort of its kind, its editors sought to make it as comprehensive as possible, and the teams felt that it asked for far more than they needed to know. They used the program questions selectively and the evaluative questions calling for a rating in each section not at all. The *Guide* deserves a new edition, not only to bring it up to date by drawing on recent evaluations, but to condense and combine and simplify, and finally, to add material on the methodology of educational evaluation.

Of their own methodology the teams would stress the follow-up stateside visit as absolutely essential. It provides the opportunity to confer with administrators and faculty, to try out hypotheses, clear up misconceptions, and take the international pulse of the campus. It can provide discussion with returned students, whose overseas experiences may be coming into perspective and perhaps bearing fruit. Discussions with students abroad too frequently partake of their malcontent of the moment, which is often borne of cultural maladjustment.

In the field visit the team members come as listeners, observers, would-be assessors, seeking to judge performance against stated objectives. Back on campus the team can sense the actual life of the whole institution and, in dialogues with the makers and implementers of policy, adjust recommendations to realities. On the occasion of these campus visits the team members found an effective role as consultants, and this new function of the teams has now been made explicit.

For the participating institutions, only the future can tell how successful the evaluations have been. As one of them answered the CIEE inquiry:

The measure of success will be determined largely by our ability both here and overseas to use productively the team's constructive recommendations, revise and modify those areas which need change, and defend or explain more clearly and carefully in the future those areas which we feel should not be changed.

It is certain, however, that the evaluation report has provided us with material which *should* enable us to improve our program in a number of ways. If we do so, we can then consider that the evaluation has been highly successful.

For the CIEE, the evaluation project marked the beginning of a new and promising chapter in its long-time efforts to improve the quality of academic programs overseas. At the same time, the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education was embarking upon its own foreign venture. In November 1972, participants in the evaluation projects of the two agencies aired their experiences in a workshop in New York. Still another recent development has been the growth of non-traditional and experiential off-campus education and the accompanying concern for its evaluation. Overseas programs represent an important body of experience with such types of learning. The development of effective methods of evaluation will make a significant contribution to higher education in America.

FOOTNOTES

¹ At the same time as the developments sketched in this paper, the accrediting agencies began to concern themselves with the evaluation of overseas programs. Allan O. Pfnister, who took a leading role in this effort, has reported on the work of the team sent abroad in 1972 by the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education in "The Evaluation of Study Abroad Programs of American Colleges and Universities," in *North Central Association Quarterly*, XLVII (Spring 1973), pp. 308-18.

² All unattributed quotes are from the technical or institutional reports of the first three teams. The report of the fourth team was not yet available at this writing. All technical reports issued by teams and the *Guide to Institutional Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Programs Abroad* are available from CIEE, 777 United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017.

³ See, e.g., Howard S. Becker, Blanche Geer and Everett Hughes, *Making the Grade: The Academic Side of Student Life* (New York: John Wiley, 1968).

⁴ Irwin T. Sanders and Jennifer C. Ward, *Bridges to Understanding: International Programs of American Colleges and Universities* (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1970), p. 78.

⁵ John P. Robinson et al, *Measures of Political Attitudes* (Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1968). See esp. Ch. 3: Liberalism-Conservatism; 6: Racial and Ethnic Attitudes; 7: International Affairs; 8: Hostility-Related National Attitudes; 10: Political Information; 13: Questions from SRC Election Studies. Also the survey by Paul A. Laudicina, *World Poverty and Development: A Survey of American Opinion* (Overseas Development Council, October, 1973). This measures both information and sympathy for development policies. On foreign language see Howard Lee Nostrand, *Research on Language Teaching: An Annotated International Bibliography, 1945-64*. (University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.). A very useful introduction to the state of the art of learning evaluation is the *Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning*, edited by Benjamin S. Bloom, et al (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1971). See also the 72nd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: *Behavior Modification in Education*, ed. by Carl E. Thoresen (University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., 1973).

⁶ On institutional evaluation see the works of Paul E. Dressel and associates, *Institutional Research in the University* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971) and other volumes in the Jossey-Bass Series in Higher Education. Also Dressel, ed., *The New Colleges: Toward an Appraisal* (American College Testing Program and AAHE, Iowa City, Ia., 1971). On innovation and area studies see Ellen McDonald Gumpers, *Internationalizing American Higher Education: Innovation and Structural Change* (Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., 1970). Many of the reports from this Center are relevant to our purpose. On non-traditional education see the reports of the Committee chaired by Samuel Gould, especially the volume by Morris T. Keeton and associates, *Experiential Learning: Rationale, Characteristics, and Assessment*. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976).

⁷ The anthology published by Herbert C. Kelman, *International Behavior. A Social-Psychological Analysis* (New York: Holt, 1965) is still a good place to start. In cross-cultural research the monograph by Harry C. Triandis, *The Analysis of Subjective Culture* (New York: Wiley, 1972) breaks new ground in the use of psychological measurements across cultures. Otto Klineberg's UNESCO study, *International Exchanges in Education, Science and Culture: Suggestions for Research* (The Hague: Mouton, 1966) is still very useful. Another important UNESCO publication is *Students as Links Between Cultures. A Cross-Cultural Survey Based on UNESCO Studies*, edited by Ingrid Eide, (UNESCO and the International Peace Research Institute, Universitetsforlaget, Oslo, 1970). For the kind of research analysis for which this paper is calling,

see W. Frank Hull, Walter H. Lemke, Jr. and Richard Ting-ku Houang, *The American Undergraduate, Off-Campus and Overseas: A Study of the Educational Validity of Such Programs*, (New York: CIEE, Occasional Paper #20, January 1977), with a helpful bibliography of such research studies. Current developments in this field can be followed in the *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, the official publication of the Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research.

⁸ Frank H. Klassen, David G. Imig and Joost Iff, *The International Dimension of American Teacher Education* (Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1972), p. 38. With a very useful bibliography.

⁹ E. J. Webb et al, *Unobtrusive Measures, Nonreactive Research in Social Sciences* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966). Also, Harold L. Hodgkinson, "Survey of the Applications of Unobtrusive Measures in Fields of Social Service. A Pilot Study Sponsored by the Kettering Foundation." (Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., 1971). Hodgkinson speaks of current "discontent with conventional methods of quantitative research in the social sciences." "In recent years," he says, "sociologist and psychologist have sought qualitative and non-reactive strategies to supplement and/or replace conventional questionnaire and survey research methods, as response rates to questionnaires decrease."

¹⁰ For techniques developed in Peace Corps training to prepare for the cross-cultural encounter, see Roger Harrison and Richard L. Hopkins, "The Design of Cross-Cultural Training: An Alternative to the University Model," in *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, III (1967), pp. 431-460. Justin Morrill College of Michigan State University has used these methods in seeking to prepare students entering its overseas Field Study Program for the roles "of objective observer and active participant."

¹¹ Sanders and Webb, *op. cit.*, p. 78.